

**CITY OF MILWAUKIE  
CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION  
APRIL 15, 1997**

**Mayor Lomnicki** called the work session to order at 5:00 p.m. at the Milwaukie Center.

Councilors present: Tomei, Schreiber, Kappa, and Trotter.

Staff present: City Manager Bartlett; Assistant to the City Manager Richards; City Attorney Oliver; City Engineer Brink; and Civil Engineer Cruz.

**Information Sharing**

1. **Councilmember Trotter** discussed the Parks District Budget and the City of Milwaukie's priorities that including: Furnberg Park Phase 2 construction; Dogwood Park/McLoughlin Master Plan; and land acquisition.
2. **Councilmember Trotter** reviewed the Fire Oversight Committee meeting discussed relative sick leave usage by the three departments. **Bartlett** commented on what might take place if the City of Milwaukie decided to cancel its intergovernmental agreement with Fire District #1. He discussed the management of funds saved as a result of the agreement. **Councilmember Kappa** expressed concern about a letter issued by Chief Bruegman regarding a conversation he (Kappa) had with some members of the fire department.
3. **Councilmember Trotter** commented on a meeting he and Councilmember Tomei had with the Clackamas County Director of Utilities Michael Read. The main Kellogg Treatment Plant issues were: odor control regardless of cost; visual mitigation to make the plant a better neighbor; and purchasing sufficient land for both the new plant and future expansion needs. **Mayor Lomnicki** commented purchasing additional land would add weight to decommissioning Kellogg.

**Councilmember Trotter** discussed existing laws that would require an upgrade of Kellogg. He and Tomei briefed Read on Milwaukie's Riverfront goals and discussed the need to develop a long-term plan before spending money on Kellogg. Read agreed it would be important to inform the Board of County Commissioners on Milwaukie's development plans and discuss technically feasible alternatives. The Sewerage Facility Study Task Force hopes to complete its work by November 1997 so the Board is able make its

decision on the proposals by December or January. The Task Force will need obtainable goals within a reasonable time frame to address the fairly complex issues. He added it was imperative for the City of Milwaukie to know the amount of funds allocated for riverfront development.

4. **Bartlett** introduced Jim Oliver of the City Attorney office.

#### **Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) Update**

Nancy Faber, Julie Wisner, and Susan Stone were present to discuss this item.

**Brink** presented the staff report and distributed a revised copy of the draft NTMP including an example of the ranking methodology and a sample informational brochure. The purpose of the NTMP was to establish a procedure for dealing with traffic problems in residential areas with vehicle speeds and volumes being the main concerns.

The program was designed to provide a City-wide policy to address citizens' traffic concerns. The main issues were speed, volume, and truck traffic. The recommendation included an annual expenditure of \$30,000 to implement the highest ranking projects. Funding would come from gas tax revenues, and the program would be similar to the City of Gresham's. The project would also need support by a majority of property owners or residents within the boundary of the proposed improvement. If the majority does not agree an improvement needs to be done, staff will discontinue the engineering process on that particular project.

**Mayor Lomnicki** asked if there was a mechanism for projects over \$30,000 that would include monetary support from affected citizens. **Brink** said forming a local improvement district is an option for any improvement. \$30,000 was the amount identified that would not overburden the Street Fund. The only options being recommended at this time was either a \$30,000 project or an improvement district.

**Bartlett** discussed approval and funding. There has also been discussion of a 50/50 cost sharing if a neighborhood wishes to advance a program.

**Councilmember Kappa** said there are advantages to forming an improvement district and asked if that would be the first approach staff would take to accomplish a project. **Brink** said other improvements, such as curbs and sidewalks, may come into play as talks with the neighborhoods progress. At that time, it may be advantageous to spread costs among the benefited property owners.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said traffic management is a City responsibility.

**Bartlett** said reports indicate communities doing this type of program require some support from abutting property owners.

**Brink** said it is not appropriate to form an improvement district for small projects. The proposed process allows citizens to partner with the City and is built on a foundation of education, enforcement, and engineering. Before a project gets to the point that funds are expended, it is important to go through the logical steps to determine if, for example, enforcement will make a difference. If education and enforcement do not result in the desired changes, then an engineering solution is necessary. In this type of program, most of the staff time will be spent working with the NDAs and the Traffic Safety and Transportation Board (TSTB).

**Brink** discussed the proposed ranking methodology to select the critical projects. The TSTB will be instrumental in working with the neighborhoods on the proposed projects.

**Councilmember Kappa** asked if the projects not selected would be placed on a three-year waiting list. **Brink** said some projects may not be competitive based on other needs within the City. Milwaukie's streets will probably not change drastically; however, projects could be reconsidered.

**Councilmember Trotter** had questions about the ranking system and particularly in the area of traffic volumes. The collector streets would always have a point advantage based on volumes. It seemed as if the program was designed to restrict volumes on collectors and neighborhood streets simultaneously. **Brink** said staff has not generated all the data on the twenty-four currently-proposed projects and suggested a pilot project to evaluate effectiveness.

**Councilmember Trotter** said he understood the desire to reduce speed, but he was concerned that reducing volumes might be counterproductive.

**Brink** discussed the 34th Avenue Speed Hump Pilot Project. Vehicle speeds were reduced from 33 to 30 miles per hour, but there was no significant change in volumes. He felt it was very important to identify the objective in each project and added land uses will also dictate vehicle usage.

**Councilmember Trotter** commented traffic management devices address speed, not volumes.

**Mayor Lomnicki** said devices such as speed humps are not intended to divert traffic to other streets, and he asked for a discussion on how volumes might be reduced.

**Councilmember Kappa** remarked that speed and volume are separate issues.

**Councilmember Trotter** referred to staff report page one and asked if there was a report on the 34th Avenue Speed Hump Pilot Project. He wanted an opportunity to ask questions about it.

**Mayor Lomnicki** said there was a draft report about six months ago, and City Council is waiting for the final report on any impacts to adjacent streets. **Bartlett** said information from the Lake Road Multi-modal and 34th Avenue Pilot projects can be combined.

**Councilmember Trotter** indicated he was not willing to vote on implementation of the NTMP until he had a better understanding of the complete program.

**Councilmember Kappa** said the NTMP refers to the draft Transportation Systems Plan (TSP), but that document has not been reviewed by either the Planning Commission or the City Council. He felt the NTMP was an ancillary document to the TSP. **Brink** said staff does not recommend postponing the NTMP until the TSP is adopted. **Bartlett** said the TSP was scheduled to go before the Planning Commission in May.

**Mayor Lomnicki** suggested a 4:00 p.m. work session at the second meeting in May that would combine all the traffic and transportation issues including the Transportation Systems Plan, Lake Road Multi-modal Connection Plan, and Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan. He reviewed the issues: volume, diversion, and definitions and examples of traffic management devices. In his opinion, it was important to go to the NDA meetings with descriptions and possible outcomes of each device.

**Councilmember Kappa** felt information from other jurisdictions' actions was important to the decision-making. He commented on the City of Portland's moratorium on speed humps because of emergency vehicle concerns.

**Councilmember Trotter** felt the relationship between traffic management devices and transit and emergency services was an important element in the problem solving process.

**Mayor Lomnicki** expressed concern that a project addressing a chronic problem could be ranked number three overall but would never make it to the top of the list because of limited funding. He asked if it was feasible to grant points based on the amount of time a project had been on the waiting list to keep it competitive. The State is experiencing this type of pitfall when prioritizing its transportation projects.

**Bartlett** said additional funding sources could be sought.

**Mayor Lomnicki** discussed traffic management needs on collector streets. Support must come from both residents and commuters to balance the needs of those living on the street and those using the street.

**Councilmember Trotter** noted the policy statement on staff report page five regarding “residential streets.” He felt the relationship between land use patterns and zoning to traffic speeds and volumes needed clarification. He was concerned a lack of information on zoning designations could result in false expectations.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said citizens need to be able to express their views and have staff analyze the situation and report its findings. She felt it was very important for the City to effectively handle emergency and special situations.

**Councilmember Kappa** asked staff to review the definition of trucks, and **Brink** indicated he would look at that section.

**Councilmember Trotter** said the program needed to include a mechanism to address traffic diversion impacts.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said the NTMP needs to consider the common good.

**Councilmember Kappa** commented the “skinny street” concept had some validity.

#### Traffic Safety and Transportation Board Comments

**Faber** said she was concerned with the sunset clause in the resolution. She suggested adopting a program with an annual review instead of designating a program that would last only two years. If the NTMP is positive and responsive to neighborhood needs, it can be evaluated and amended as it evolves. She asked how chronic neighborhood traffic problems would be addressed if a project was rejected. Could property owners add funding and get a higher ranking on the project list under this program? **Mayor Lomnicki** said if a project is not selected, enforcement and education would continue.

**Faber** referred to staff report page eight that outlined how points were determined for projects and suggested adding information on bus and walking routes. She asked how the City would gather input when Metro 2040 densities were met and many residents were not the property owners. **Mayor Lomnicki** said affected property owners would be involved in LID formations, and residents could go through their respective neighborhood associations.

**Faber** suggested the description of the local survey on staff report page eleven include not only eligible property owners but also residents. She indicated interest in attending the May 20 work session and requested an updated packet.

**Stone** said the NTMP was a policy that should be established for a longer period of time than two years. She commented on the need for current traffic counts.

**Mayor Lomnicki** referred to staff report page twelve where it was stated that the chronic nature of the problem had to be validated before funding was approved.

**Stone** felt referring to the engineering solution as a last resort if all else fails had a negative connotation and suggested the language be changed. She supported traffic calming measure and keeping cost factors in check. **Stone** recommended a statement in the TSP that creating and maintaining traffic patterns in established neighborhoods was a goal of the NTMP. Referring to staff report page five, she urged collector streets be considered for traffic control devices based on vehicle speeds and volumes. She questioned the reference to the gas tax revenues and annual budget in the NTMP Goals. She then referred to the discussion of traffic calming on emergency routes. A firefighter informed her that ambulances are not considered emergency response vehicles since they were privately owned. The TSTB agreed with Brink's earlier comment about the Board's vital role in dealing with citizen input.

**Stone** discussed the proposed ranking system. She felt it was unrealistic to base points on Speed Watch sessions because of the number of citizen volunteers required for each session. She felt the sections referring to the number of favorable property owner responses were unclear. Beaverton, she added, has no ranking system for its traffic calming projects.

**Councilmember Kappa** requested staff prepare a report of City Council and TSTB comments and concerns.

**Stone** expressed concern that each project would take over a year to complete following the timelines in the staff report. **Mayor Lomnicki** said there were some concurrent elements in the proposal that would shorten the timeframe.

**Stone** commented on Council's not re-appointing her to the TSTB. She felt she was a dedicated City volunteer, and the Council's action was a contrived, political move. **Mayor Lomnicki** said the Council felt a change was appropriate and added all off-going board and commission members would be recognized at the May 6, 1997, meeting.

**Stone** felt volunteers like herself were hard to find and asked why she was not re-appointed. **Mayor Lomnicki** said the Municipal Code states all board and commission members serve at the pleasure of the Council. All advisory boards and commissions reviewed the draft ordinances before Council adopted them last year. **Stone** did not consider the Mayor's response satisfactory. It was a

bold move and not in the best interest of the community. She said she works for the citizens, but now she is being told to stay away. The ordinance is also written to allow for term extensions if the City Council so chooses.

**Councilmember Schreiber** said it was the City Council's decision.

**Councilmember Trotter** did not understand her position since many have applied for board and commission vacancies and were not appointed for both objective and subjective reasons.

**Stone** said she thought TSTB was the only board that did not have a quorum. Council appointed two TSTB members to other boards, and she was not re-appointed. Bartlett sent a letter to the rest of the TSTB directing them not to meet until there were enough appointments to achieve a quorum. She said she was "up to speed" on the issues, and by not re-appointing her, the heart was being taken from the TSTB.

### **SB 122 Update**

This work session topic was carried over to April 29, 1997, due to time constraints.

**Mayor Lomnicki** adjourned the work session at 6:50 p.m.

---

Pat DuVal, City Recorder